



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,964	09/24/2003	Yukihiko Minamida	031206	1481
23850	7590	07/01/2005	EXAMINER	
ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP			SERGENT, RABON A	
1725 K STREET, NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1000				1711
WASHINGTON, DC 20006			DATE MAILED: 07/01/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/668,964	MINAMIDA ET AL.	
	Examiner Rabon Sergent	Art Unit 1711	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 April 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1711

1. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The extra "(X)" to the immediate right of the formula for the catalyst has not been defined or explained.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helmeke et al. ('073) in view of Lee et al. ('793) or Oertel.

Helmeke et al. disclose moisture curable hot melt polyurethane adhesives, wherein the adhesives comprise polyurethane prepolymers, derived from diphenylmethane diisocyanate and polyester polyols. Patentees further disclose that the polyester is derived from polyols and phthalic acid. Furthermore, morpholine ether catalysts are disclosed as being preferred. See

abstract; column 1, lines 50-59; column 2, lines 50+; column 3, lines 1-4 and 65+; column 4, lines 44-53; and examples.

4. Helmeke et al. are silent regarding the incorporation of sulfonic acids into the adhesive compositions; however, sulfonic acids were known inhibitors for isocyanate reactions, especially in the presence of amine catalysts, such as applicants' claimed morpholine ether catalyst. This position is supported by the teachings of Oertel at pages 96 and 97 and Lee et al. (see abstract).

It is noted that Lee et al. disclose at column 6, lines 50-53 that alternative prepolymer embodiments may be employed, such as those disclosed within U.S. Patent 4,411,262 (U.S. Patent 4,411,262 discloses polyurethane prepolymers derived from polyester polyols).

Therefore, the position is taken that it would have been obvious to incorporate sulfonic acids into the amine catalyzed polyurethane prepolymer adhesives of the primary reference, so as to extend shelf life, potlife, and workability of the adhesive.

5. The examiner has considered the 37 CFR 1.132 declaration of April 13, 2005; however, the declaration is insufficient to overcome the prior art rejection for the following reasons.

Firstly, the declaration is not commensurate in scope with the claims, with respect to species and quantities of components. Secondly, applicants' results are not unexpected. The most relevant comparison stems from a review of Comparative Example 3 and Example 1, wherein the difference appears to be that Example 1 employs a sulfonate compound (it is noted that the methane sulfonate does not correspond to the claimed acid compounds, so the declaration is additionally deficient for this reason). The results of this comparison are what one of ordinary skill in the art would expect, considering the disclosed function of the inhibitor compounds.

Specifically, Example 1 displays a slower viscosity build and decreased creep resistance,

suggesting a longer open-time. Since sulfonic acid inhibitors retard the reaction, these are exactly the results that one would expect from its addition to the adhesive composition.

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to R. Sergent at telephone number (571) 272-1079.

  
RABON SERGENT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

R. Sergent  
June 27, 2005